

## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-20, and 22-23 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 5, 21, and 24-26 were previously cancelled. All of the claims depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is amended. No new matter has been entered as the newly added claim language is fully supported by the drawings.

Applicant was surprised and disappointed by the Examiner's decision to remove his allowance of claim 5, which has ultimately resulted in significant cost and time to applicants, particularly in view of the fact that the Ng reference adds nothing new to the previously cited references. Applicant requests reconsideration of the claims in the view of the following arguments and amendments.

Firstly, the Examiner stated in his office action that the decision to remove his allowance of claim 5 is based upon the "newly discovered reference to Ng et. Al (U.S. 2003/0193478)." The examiner states that Ng teaches a QWERTY style key arrangement where a left side section is oriented at least partially above a right side section, referring to Fig. 1 of Ng. Applicant takes exception to the Examiner's characterization of Fig. 1 of Ng, which is submitted to be completely wrong. If you read Ng, you will see that Fig. 1 is described in the following manner:

Fig. 1 shows how a QWERTY, and likewise a QWERTY-type, keyboard 10 is mapped visually by the user and how it could be segmented into six sections 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 and the segmented characters assigned into six multi-character keys.

(Ng at col. 5, paragraph 0048). As is clear, Ng only teaches that the keys can be broken into six different segments. It does not teach arranging the keys into the two groups of keys taught by claim 1. It teaches six groups, not two. Furthermore, as shown in Figs. 3-9, none of the embodiments of Ng teach a left side section that is positioned above a right side section. At most, as relevant herein, Ng teaches that a QWERTY keyboard can be split into different segments. Ng doesn't teach what the Examiner states it teaches in any way, shape, or form.

Karidis, which is the second new reference asserted by the Examiner, teaches a keyboard that has a left and right side section, where the right side section can be ratcheted up to be positioned above the left side section. Karidis does not teach splitting the keys into left and right side sections according to the claimed grouping of letters claimed in claim 1. Moreover, with respect to claim 1, Karidis does not teach that a

bottom row of the left side section is at least in part positioned above a top row of the right side section; or that a bottom row of the right side section is at least in part positioned above a top row of the left side section. In Figs. 2a-2c of Karidis, the bottom row of the right side section is always well below the top row of the left side section. In Fig. 7a, where left and right side sections are ratcheted up above a center section, neither of the bottom rows of the left and right side sections are ever positioned above the top row of the center section.

Even when Karidis and Ng are combined, the resulting combination does not teach amended claim 1. And applicant also submits it would be improper to combine Ng with Karidis since Karidis already teaches a QWERTY keyboard with separate sections. There would be no reason to look to Ng for any of its teachings, unless it were to split the two sections into six—which is not relevant here. Thus, in view of the above arguments, applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Ng and Karidis.

The dependent claims were rejected based upon a combination of other references, which will not be independently listed herein as they are clearly set forth in the office action. Applicants submit that none of the additional references remedies the deficiencies noted above for the combination of Ng and Karidis. For this reason, the remaining dependent claims are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, as discussed above.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the pending claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help to resolve any remaining issues.

A fee for a one month extension of time is submitted to be required and is submitted concurrently herewith. Should any other fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-1432.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2008



Lorri W. Cooper  
JONES DAY  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7097

Reg. No. 40,038